



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/898,549

07/03/2001

Erno Kovacs

450117-03450

2858

22850

7590

08/24/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

1940 DUKE STREET

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/898,549

Applicant(s)

KOVACS ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10 are subject to examination. Claims 6 and 8 are cancelled.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10 is maintained.

Applicant states (1), "Applicants request acknowledgement of the IDS filed on October 16, 2001".

For clarification, form **PTO-1449** was not submitted with the IDS filed on October 16, 2001. So far, none of the forms (PTO-1449) dated October 16, 2001 have been available to the examiner, for examining purpose; the examiner has no information regarding the prior art references of the IDS that can be used for the examination of this application under prosecution.

Applicant states (2), "Helgeson describes a system and method to translate data from a system specific local format to generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined style sheets using generic components and a system specific service component which uses a native application programming interface of the specific local system", "Figure 5 of Helgeson shows the core services 503 and applications 507. One problem addressed by Helgeson is that of circular dependencies. Accordingly, the architecture of Helgeson is such that circular dependencies are avoided by requiring that all dependencies be directed downwards. Thus, an application (i.e. a special service) may depend on one or more sets of core services", "MPEP

Art Unit: 2154

706.02 notes that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, ...”,

and argues, “the combination of Helgeson and Gershman is improper and the office action does not present a prima facie case of obviousness because Helgeson teaches away from the claimed invention and Helgeson fails to disclose the features of applicant’s claimed invention asserted by the office action”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. First, the teachings of the Helgeson reference are **not limited** as asserted by the applicant, i.e., “a system and method to translate data from a system specific local format to generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined style sheets using generic components and a system specific service component which uses a native application programming interface of the specific local system and figure 5”. Second, the Helgeson reference also teach / disclose the relied upon limitations (please refer to the below rejections for the broadly claimed subject matter). The Helgeson reference to disclose a different type of things / scenarios does not mean that they teach away, as they are alternatives that can be used. In fact, the claimed invention is neither limited to a particular system including several systems of the Helgeson and Gershman. Contrary to the applicant’s assertions, the claimed invention is not limited or concerned with the circular dependencies. The claimed invention mentions that communicating is **directly** between two objects (i.e., services) which **is** in fact **contrary** with communicating **via the controller** (see claim 1) (using) between the two objects (i.e., services). The claimed invention is for providing access from **a client to a multimedia service**, to a method for accessing a portal application from a client as well as to a multimedia service comprising a portal application, please see page

Art Unit: 2154

1, lines 10 – 13 of the specification of this application under prosecution, which does not limit what a client and/or multimedia service and/or portal application can be.

The claimed invention does not support how **a direct communication** is different than other communication means as both support communicating information between the client and the multimedia service.

Page 1, lines 14-15 of the specification of this application under prosecution, also clearly states, “The present invention generally lies in the field of mobile multimedia systems, computer networking, distributed processing systems, databases, hand-held computers and wireless communication”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant states (3), “Conner describes a method in a server that substantiates a table format object the dynamic data abstraction with one of its set of data objects through a common interface. The common interface enables page developers to author customize data getter objects that are used to access data in the set of data objects. The dynamic data abstracted from the given data objects through the common interface are formatted into the table according to the table format object. Resulting table with dynamic data is then served back to the requesting client browser”,

and argues, “the combination of the cited references is improper”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. First, the teachings of the Conner reference are **not limited** as asserted by the applicant, i.e., “a method in

Art Unit: 2154

a server that substantiates a table format object the dynamic data abstraction with one of its set of data objects through a common interface. The common interface enables page developers to author customize data getter objects that are used to access data in the set of data objects. The dynamic data abstracted from the given data objects through the common interface are formatted into the table according to the table format object. Resulting table with dynamic data is then served back to the requesting client browser". Second, the Conner reference also teach / disclose the relied upon limitations (please refer to the below rejections for the broadly claimed subject matter). The claimed invention is neither limited to a particular system including several systems of the Helgeson, Gershman and/or Conner. Contrary to the applicant's assertions, the claimed invention is not limited or concerned with a server that substantiates a table format object, common interface, dynamic data abstracted, etc. The claimed invention mentions that communicating is directly between two objects (i.e., services) which is in fact contrary with communicating via the controller (see claim 1) (using) between the two objects (i.e., services). The claimed invention is for providing access from a client to a multimedia service, to a method for accessing a portal application from a client as well as to a multimedia service comprising a portal application, please see page 1, lines 10 – 13 of the specification of this application under prosecution, which does not limit what a client and/or multimedia service and/or portal application can be.

The claimed invention does not support how a direct communication is different than other communication as both support communicating information between the client and the multimedia service.

Art Unit: 2154

Page 1, lines 14-15 of the specification of this application under prosecution, also clearly states, "The present invention generally lies in the field of mobile multimedia systems, computer networking, distributed processing systems, databases, hand-held computers and wireless communication". Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al. 6,643,652 (Hereinafter Helgeson) in view of Gershman et. al. 6,199,099 (Hereafter Gershman).

5. As per claims 1 and 9, Helgeson teaches the following:

a portal application embodied on a tangible computer readable medium comprising instructions which causes a processor-based device to provide access from a client (e.g., figures 1, 3) to a multimedia service, the portal application comprising instructions for: (e.g., col., 51, lines 25 – 52),

a portal core service (e.g., figures 1, 3, col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11, col. 7, lines 47 – 61),

Art Unit: 2154

a user management core service (e.g., figures 1, 3, col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11, col. 7, lines 47 – 61); and

wherein the portal application comprises a plurality / two of special services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11, col. 7, lines 47 – 61),

each structured according to the model-view-controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), and

each of said special services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11, col. 7, lines 47 – 61), comprising

at least one model containing data (e.g., database management system 309, col. 11, lines 27 – 38, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10),

a controller for the special service (e.g., col., 51, lines 54 – col., 52, line 38) and

at least one view for the presentation of data of a model (col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10),

wherein each of the plurality of special services (e.g., col., 4, lines 39 – 54, col., 5, line 56 – col., 6, line 11) are designed to communicate with each of a remaining plurality of special services / the other special services, usage of controller of the special service / via a respective controller (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40) using the controller (e.g., col., 51, lines 54 – col., 52, line 38, col. 11, lines 27 – 38),

a plurality of views (e.g., an application would typically also include UI components (such as JSP pages or servlets) which would use such business components, col., 27, lines 20-47), for the presentation of data of different mark-up languages (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4),



Art Unit: 2154

multimedia service comprises a portal application (e.g., services offered by information server, interface server, business server of the SABA business platform, figure 17),

sending a request to a first core service responsible for user management and/or administrative processing (e.g., communication between the applications, common business objects and the core services, figure 5),

forwarding, according to the model-view-controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40), the request from the first core service (e.g., figure 5, block 503) to a second special service (e.g., figure 5, blocks, 529, 531), and

establishing a communication between the client and the second special service (e.g., client connection to the SABA business platform services supported by the interface server, figure 17, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract).

However, Helgeson do not specifically mention about communicating with each of a remaining plurality of services directly (direct communication link), via controller.

Gershman discloses the well-known concept of communicating with each of a remaining plurality of services directly (direct communication link) (e.g., paragraphs 181, 281-284, 289), via controller (e.g., 286 – 288, 384 – 388).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Helgeson with the teachings of Gershman in order to facilitate communicating with each of a remaining plurality of services directly (direct communication link) / via controller because the direct (direct communication link) / via controller communication would provide enhanced way of communicating between services. The services would provide information to each other using the enhanced communication mechanism.

6. Claims 2-5, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson and Gershman in view of Conner et al., 6,718,515 (Hereinafter Conner).

7. As per claims 2-5, 7, 10, Helgeson and Gershman disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Helgeson also teaches the following:

a controller (e.g., Servlet, col., 27, lines 20-47) of a service is designed to select one of a plurality of views (e.g., Java Server Pages, col., 27, lines 20-47) of the service in accordance with a mark-up language used, the state of the controller is a function of a client's request, the special services are distributed over a network (e.g., HTML, XSL/XSLT, WAP/WML, etc. figure 4, The present mechanism provides a solution to the needs described above through a system and method for managing data exchange among systems in a network. The systems and methods of the present mechanism translate data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, and vice versa, with predefined stylesheets using generic components and a system specific service components which utilize a native application programming interface of the specific local system, abstract),

a state of the controller is determined in accordance with an earlier client's request (e.g., col., 114, lines 48 – 57, col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40) and forwarding according to the model view controller architecture (e.g., col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40),

a controller of a service is designed to control at least second controller (e.g., col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45),

wherein said controller is contained in said service or in a different service (e.g., Servlet controlling another servlet handling a service , col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45),

the controller of a service is designed to control a plurality of views each of said plurality of views allows a different presentation (e.g., col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45),

said plurality of views is representative of at least two different mark-up languages (e.g., col., 27, line 20 – col. 28, line 45, figure 4),

service relative content and a state of the controller is determined in accordance with an earlier client's request (e.g., col., 114, lines 48 – 57, col., 11, lines 28 – 45, col., 49, line 55 – col., 50, line 10, col., 50, line 53 – col., 51, line 40),

in accordance with at least one of a browser characteristic of the client, device characteristics, time and/or date location, language, and one or more user preferences (e.g., depending on locales, languages, timezones, and display formats, etc., col., 7, lines 5 – 61).

However, Helgeson and Gershman do not specifically mention about service relative content of each of said plurality of views is identical.

Conner discloses the well-known concept of service relative content of each of said plurality of views is identical (e.g., paragraph 5).

Art Unit: 2154

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Helgeson and Gershman with the teachings of Conner in order to facilitate service relative content of each of said plurality of views is identical because the plurality of views would utilize the same content information. Utilizing the same content information would avoid duplicate effort for supporting different view.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

Art Unit: 2154

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

August 14, 2006

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100